

DELEGATED FULL APPLICATION REPORT

Ward: Katesgrove Ward

App Ref: PL/24/1083

Address: 11 Glebe Road, Reading, RG2 7AG

Proposal: Extension and conversion of existing building into eight flats and erection of one house (Class C3)

Case Officer: Louise Coveney- Fuller

Expiry Date: 07/11/2024

Application Site

The application site is at the corner of Glebe Road and Christchurch Gardens and currently contains a large two and a half storey building, known as Whitley Glebe, which also has a single storey side extension facing Glebe Road. There are two formal vehicular/ pedestrian access points from Glebe Road.

The area is predominantly residential with a mix of traditional semis and detached dwellings, including bungalows. The neighbouring plot at no. 9 Glebe Road is of a more modern style. The site is bounded by residential properties to the north, along Glebe Road, and to the east along Christchurch Gardens. There are also residential uses to the south and west of the site. To the north-east of the site is Christ Church along Christchurch Road, which is Grade II* Listed, and Christchurch Vicarage along Vicarage Road, which is Grade II Listed. The site is bounded to the west and north-east by the Christchurch Conservation Area.

The site has well established landscaped borders with a large area of trees, including TPOs (TPO 78/08) to the Christchurch Gardens/Glebe Road frontage.

Proposal

Extension and conversion of existing building into eight flats and erection of one house (Class C3)



This assessment is based on the following submitted plans and other supporting information.

P.M. 400 Rev D- Proposed Site Plan 15.5.24

P.M.500 Rev B – Proposed Ground Floor Plan 15.5.24

P.M.501 Rev C – Proposed First Floor Plan 15.5.24

P.M.502 Rev B -Proposed Second Floor Plan 15.5.24

P.M.503 Rev A- Proposed Floor Plans 15.5.24

P.M.600 Rev B – Proposed Elevations 15.5.24

P.M.601 Rev C- Proposed Rear and Side elevations 15.5.24

P.M.602 Rev B- Street Scenes 15.5.24

P.M.603 Rev A- Plot 1 Proposed Elevations 15.5.24

P.M.604 Rev A- Cycle Bin Store Floor Plans and Elevations 15.5.24

P.M.701 Rev A- & P.M.702 Rev A - Proposed 3d Views 15.5.24
Air Quality Assessment – July 2024
Environmental Noise Assessment – June 2024
Topographical Survey – July 2024
Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan – July 2024
Root Protection Area Plan - July
Ecological Appraisal – 31/7/2024
Biodiversity Net Gain – Biological Impact Assessment
Received 20.08.24

Relevant Planning History

08/00425/FUL (080022) - Demolition of existing building and erection of 14 x 2 bed apartments, provision of car parking and alteration to vehicular access – Refused 26/6/2008

90/00047/FUL (900564) - Change of use of first floor from residential to doctors surgery; retention of second floor as residential. Extension to car park – Approved 19/4/1990

89/01221/FUL (891162) - Relaxation of condition 4 of planning permission 82/TP/250 (personal user restriction) – Approved 23/11/1989

82/TP/250 – Change of use of ground floor from residential to doctor's surgery retaining first and second floors as residential – Approved 15/7/1982

08/01447/FUL - Change of use of ground floor and first floor from medical consulting rooms to residential use – Approved 19/1/2009

Representations

Neighbour letters were sent to the occupiers of nearby properties and a site notice was displayed by the Case Officer on the 27/09/24.

At the time of writing this report, 9 objection letters have been received raising the following planning material consideration concerns (summarised below) :

- higher traffic and foot presence in an already over congested, small residential area
- The proposal is not in keeping with the conservation model that keeps Glebe Road and Christchurch Gardens unique.
- It would be a travesty to see such a lovely old established building being defaced and deconstructed in this way.
- unclear the extent to which the site will be landscaped on completion
- potential disturbances and environmental costs
- There is a distinct lack of need for this type of development in this area.
- The proposed development disproportionately overshadows, and increases the loss of privacy for several neighbouring properties.
- The proposed development is of a very poor quality and size.

Consultations

Ecology: see main body of officer report below

Transport: see main body of officer report below

Natural Environment: see main body of officer report below

Heritage: see main body of officer report below

Environmental Health: Conditions recommended

Equality Act 2010:

In determining this application, the Council is required to have regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However, there is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that the protected groups identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application. Therefore, in terms of the key equalities protected characteristics it is considered there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

LEGAL AND PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Material considerations include relevant policies in the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) - among them the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

PLANNING POLICY

The following local and national planning policy and guidance is relevant to this application:

National Planning Policy Framework (2023) as amended

The following NPPF chapters are the most relevant (others apply to a lesser extent):

- 2. Achieving sustainable development
- 4. Decision-making
- 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
- 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities
- 9. Promoting sustainable transport
- 11. Making effective use of land
- 12. Achieving well-designed and beautiful places
- 15. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

National Planning Policy Guidance (2014 onwards)

Reading Borough Local Plan (2019)

- CC1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction
- CC3: Adaptation to Climate Change
- CC5: Waste Minimisation and Storage
- CC6: Accessibility and the Intensity of Development
- CC7: Design and the Public Realm
- CC8: Safeguarding Amenity
- CC9: Securing Infrastructure
- EN1: Protection and Enhancement of Historic Environment
- EN3: Enhancement of the Conservation Area
- EN4: Locally Important Heritage Assets
- EN12: Biodiversity and the Green Network
- EN14: Trees, Hedges and Woodland
- EN15: Air Quality
- EN16: Pollution and Water Resources
- H1: Provision of Housing
- H2: Density and Mix
- H3: Affordable Housing
- H5: Standards for New Housing
- H10: Private and Communal Outdoor Space
- H11: Development of Private Residential Gardens
- TR1: Achieving the Transport Strategy
- TR3: Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters

TR5: Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging

RBC Supplementary Planning Documents

Affordable Housing SPD (2021)

Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD (2011)

Revised SPD on Planning Obligations under Section 106 (2019)

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2019)

Biodiversity Action Plan (2021)

Other relevant documentation / guidance / legislation

National Design Guide: Planning practice for beautiful, enduring and successful places (2019)

Christchurch Conservation Area Appraisal (2010)

Planning Considerations

Design, Character and Impact on the Heritage Assets

Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) seeks to ensure that new development enhances and preserves the local character. Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) states that the design of outdoor areas will respect the size and character of other similar spaces in the vicinity.

Policies EN1 and EN3 refer to the protection of conservation areas, including their setting. Policy EN4 states that “Development proposals that affect locally important heritage assets will demonstrate that development conserves architectural, archaeological or historical significance which may include the appearance, character and setting of the asset.

Paragraph 96 of the NPPF 2023 states that decision should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places and beautiful buildings.

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF 2023 states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF 2023 details that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF requires that ‘The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.’

The National Design Guidance identifies 10 key components for good design and of particular note is the characteristic of ‘Context’ and it states that “well designed new development responds positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary. It should enhance positive qualities and improve negative ones.” Additionally, there is specific reference to ‘views inwards and outwards’

The existing building No.11 Glebe Road is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Whilst the site is not currently within the Christchurch Conservation Area (borders), it is within the proposed extension of the Conservation Area currently at consultation.

The emerging conservation area appraisal states, *“Two distinctive houses bordering Christchurch Gardens: ‘Whitley Glebe’ at 11 Glebe Road, designed and occupied by local architect Montague Wheeler. (...)*

It was felt that the 11 Glebe Road on the corner with Christchurch Gardens, by local architect Montague Wheeler, was a significant building in its own right and worthy of inclusion described by Pevsner as ‘...free Cotswold seventeenth-century style, otherwise barely seen in Reading’.”

The current Christchurch Conservation Area Appraisal notes *“The Christchurch Conservation Area comprises a tightly drawn, essentially Victorian/Edwardian suburb of Reading, loosely centred on Christchurch itself, a Grade II* listed building.”*

The proposed extensions with dormers to Number 11 Glebe Road to create 8 flats would disrupt the visual integrity dominate the host building. Its depth and width are excessive and overpower the existing structure. In turn, this results in a negative impact on the visual balance within the building and nearby conservation area. The extensions fail to respect the built form, ridge height and building lines of the existing building that the original massing and design would be unreadable due to this unsympathetic design. In addition, the proposed works would also intrude into the view of the spire, tower and roof of Grade II Listed Christ Church from Glebe Road. Furthermore, the proposed roof enlargements would result in a disjointed relationship between Number 11 and the proposed flats which fails to harmonise with the existing roof form.

In addition to these concerns, it is noted that the proposed extensions and conversion to number 11 Glebe Road to create the 8 flats would bring the built form within the site very close to the common boundary with Number 9 Glebe Road. This would result in the loss of the characteristic gap between the properties. It is noted that the characteristics gap has been retained within the immediate surroundings and the proposed development would therefore detract from the visual amenity of the surroundings.

The harm of this proposed development is exacerbated further by the proposed erection of a new dwelling to the within the application site to the side of the Number 11. This area is currently open and well screened by existing established vegetation (it is noted that TPO'S are also present on the site) which contributes to the leafy feel of the adjacent Christchurch Conservation Area. The insertion of this new dwelling would result in a tight cramped development with very little space which is at odds with the existing spacious, verdant character of the site. The dwelling would appear imposed upon the site, rather than a sensitive, appropriate response to the specific context. The size of dwelling together with its access, parking and hard landscaping arrangements would have little regard to the existing character and would appear stark and obtrusive in this prominent location.

The harm to heritage assets would be “less than substantial”. The benefits of the scheme would mostly be that the proposal would introduce new dwellings which would be beneficial in terms of meeting housing need in a general sense. However, the overall effect of the proposal would be an overdeveloped, insensitive and visually harmful form of development which has little respect for the existing context. It is likely that at least some of the benefits could be achieved in a far more sensitive manner with less harm to heritage assets. The general nature of the benefits does not outweigh the specific harm identified.

When taken as a whole the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site at odds with the existing prevailing pattern of development. The arrangement would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Christchurch Conservation Area. The unsatisfactory appearance in relation to the existing building would harm the visual setting of II* listed Christ Church and the setting of the Christchurch Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), Policy EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment), Policy EN3 (Enhancement of the Conservation Area) and Policy H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 96, 123, 128, 131, 135, 136 and 201 and 209 of the NPPF 2023.

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenity

Policy CC8 requires development to not cause a detrimental impact on the living environment of existing residential properties or unacceptable living conditions for new residential properties, in terms of: Privacy and overlooking; Access to sunlight and daylight; Visual dominance and overbearing effects of a development; Harm to outlook; Noise and disturbance; Artificial lighting; Vibration; Dust and fumes; Smell; Crime and safety.

It is noted that the flats would be constructed very close to the common boundary with Number 9. This proximity, combined with the proposed scale would result in an overbearing impact on the occupants of this property. Therefore, the proposed extensions and alterations to Number 11 Glebe Road by virtue of their scale and siting would result in adverse harm to residential amenities in terms of overbearing impact on the occupants of Number 9 Glebe Road due to overbearing effects.

The proposed new dwelling given its siting away from immediate neighbours raises no significant concerns in terms of its impact on neighbouring properties.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF 2023.

Amenity of Future Occupiers

Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) seeks that all new building housing is built to high standards and Policy H10 (Private and Communal Outdoor Space) seeks that residential developments are provided with adequate private or communal outdoor amenity space.

There would be sufficient space for gardens in purely functional terms. However, in the case of this particular site this is outweighed by the visual harm arising from buildings, boundary treatments, hard surfacing and domestic paraphernalia referred to above.

There are significant concerns that the upper floor flats would not provide adequate headroom or floor space for future occupiers. The application does not demonstrate that this could be achieved. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 123 and 135 of the NPPF 2023.

Impact on Natural Environment - Trees/Landscaping

Policy EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland) seeks to extend the Borough's vegetation cover and that development should make provision for tree planting whilst Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm) seeks proposals should include appropriate landscaping. Given that the site is also located in part within an Air Quality Management Area, tree retention and planting is a high priority and proposals should demonstrate an appropriate level of greening and/or net gain in the tree number.

The proposals involve the removal of a number of existing trees which contribute to the vegetated character and the provision of a largely hard-landscaped frontage to Glebe Road. This is considered to impact negatively on the character of the area (as discussed above) and the proposal fails to demonstrate acceptable provision of tree planting and soft landscaping. This would have a harmful effect on the visual amenity, biodiversity and environmental quality of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019, the Reading Borough Council Tree Strategy 2021, and paragraphs 135, 136 and 180 of the NPPF 2023.

Ecology Considerations

Policy EN12 (Biodiversity and The Green Network) requires that new development should provide a net gain for biodiversity where possible and should incorporate biodiversity features into proposals where practical. Furthermore, from 12 February 2024, amendments to Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the

Environment Act 2021) made it mandatory for all developments in England to provide a biodiversity net gain of 10%.

There is an impact on ecology, that is closely related to the stark, overdeveloped nature of what is proposed. The proposal removes significant amounts of vegetation and replaces it with buildings and paved areas. It is considered that the proposed development would result in a loss of biodiversity due to the loss of broadleaved woodland, which is also a Priority Habitat and within a Green Link. This would unacceptably fragment the green network and harm the ecological value of the site. Furthermore, the proposed development fails to demonstrate a statutory net gain. The application has failed to correctly assess the pre-development biodiversity value of the site as it fails to take into account the value of 6 recently felled trees within the baseline. As such, the proposals would not deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain. It has also not been demonstrated that the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy could be complied with, and that the biodiversity gain condition could be discharged. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network), EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 136, 180 and 186 of the NPPF 2023.

Transport Considerations

Policies TR1 (Achieving the Transport Strategy), TR3 (Access, Traffic and Highway-Related Matters) and TR5 (Car and Cycle Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging) seek to address access, traffic, highway and parking relates matters relating to development.

The existing building is located on a large plot on the corner of Glebe Road and Christchurch Gardens.

Local parking standards are set out in the RBC, Revised Parking Standards and Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which takes into account the accessibility of the site. The site is located in Zone 2, Primary Core Area, of the Revised Parking Standards and Design SPD. The proposed development is well served by public transport and located on a frequent bus service. In line with the adopted parking standards, two parking spaces are required for the detached 4 bedroom dwelling and one parking space per 1 or 2 bedroom flat. It has not been demonstrated that this could be accommodated without significant harm to the character and appearance of the site, which is further indication of overdevelopment and inadequate design. There is also a functional concern in that the proposed vehicular parking layout would introduce an excessive number of accesses and pavement crossovers which would harm pedestrian safety and unnecessarily impact on the availability of on-street parking. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies TR3 and TR5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

It is acknowledged that a revised site plan was submitted during the course of the application seeking to address transport related matters. As noted elsewhere in this report, the issues raised by the proposals are more fundamental and to accept the plan in isolation without all other matters being addressed would have introduced a confusing element into consideration of the application.

Affordable Housing

In accordance with Policy H3 (Affordable Housing) the proposed development, being for 8 additional dwellings, would be liable for an off-site affordable housing contribution equivalent of 20% of the GDV of the development.

No GDV valuations (to calculate the contribution) have been submitted. Instead, paragraph 43 of the planning statement states:

“However para.65 of the December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), makes clear that the provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, i.e. 10 or more dwellings, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). As

this site is within the built up area of Reading, the affordable housing requirement should not be applied in line with the NPPF.”

Further to discussion with the agent (officer confirming LPA position in respect of Affordable Housing) a Viability Appraisal has been submitted with the application to justify a nil provision. This viability appraisal is currently under review by the Council's Valuer. However, the application proposal raises other concerns that are detailed elsewhere in this report. With regard to viability discussions, these could continue; however, the concerns raised are well beyond any situation whereby an Affordable Housing offer would affect the overall planning balance in this instance, noting also the nil provision proposed.

Therefore, the viability submission is not agreed, and the proposal is not making an appropriate contribution towards affordable housing. Therefore, the application will be refused on the basis of not providing an appropriate contribution to affordable housing and being in the absence of a s106 legal agreement to secure that appropriate contribution towards affordable housing, contrary to Policy H3 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

CIL

The proposal would be a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liable development if approved. If the scheme had been acceptable an informative would have been attached to the decision notice to advise the applicant of their responsibilities in this respect.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the overall effect of the proposal would be an overdeveloped, insensitive and visually harmful form of development which would harm the setting of nearby heritage assets and the character and appearance of the area within which it is proposed to be located. The proposal would harm the amenity of neighbours and it has not been demonstrated that it would provide a suitable standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The impact on biodiversity and insufficient soft landscaping are further shortcomings, particularly pertinent given the felling of trees on site. In addition, the proposals do not make adequate provision for affordable housing with consequent harm to meeting housing need and the aims of achieving sustainable mixed and balanced communities.

As such, the recommendation is to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed development, due to its excessive scale and plot coverage and visually stark frontage, would represent a cramped overdevelopment of the site which would fail to satisfactorily integrate buildings, parking areas and landscaping in a manner that maintains and enhances the existing spacious vegetated character of the area. This arrangement would result in consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Christchurch Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), Policy EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment), Policy EN3 (Enhancement of the Conservation Area) and Policy H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 96, 123, 128, 131, 135, 136 and 201 of the NPPF 2023.

2. The proposed development, due to its excessive scale, bulky form, unsympathetic appearance and visual prominence would represent a dominant, incongruous and unattractive addition to No.11 Glebe Road, a non-designated heritage asset. This unsatisfactory arrangement would be harmful to appearance of the existing building, street scene and would interrupt the historical pattern of development with consequent harm to the visual setting of II* listed Christ Church and the character and appearance of the Christchurch Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), Policy EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment), Policy EN3 (Enhancement of the Conservation Area) and Policy H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 96, 123, 128, 131, 135, 136, 201 and 209 of the NPPF 2023.

3. The proposed development, due to its scale and siting in close proximity with No.9 Glebe Road, would result in overbearing effects, harmful to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraph 135 of the NPPF 2023.

4. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that there would be adequate headroom and floor space to serve future occupiers of the upper floor flats with consequent harm to their amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CC8 (Safeguarding Amenity) and Policy H5 (Standards for New Housing) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 123 and 135 of the NPPF 2023.

5. The proposed development fails to demonstrate acceptable provision of tree planting and soft landscaping with consequent harm to the visual amenity, biodiversity and environmental quality of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CC7 (Design and the Public Realm), EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 as well as the Reading Borough Council Tree Strategy 2021 and paragraphs 135, 136 and 180 of the NPPF 2023.

6. The proposed development would result in a loss of biodiversity due to the loss of broadleaved woodland, which is also a Priority Habitat and within a Green Link. This would unacceptably fragment the green network and harm the ecological value of the site. Furthermore, the proposed development fails to demonstrate a statutory net gain. The application has failed to correctly assess the pre-development biodiversity value of the site as it fails to take into account the value of 6 recently felled trees within the baseline. As such, the proposals would not deliver a Biodiversity Net Gain. It has also not been demonstrated that the Biodiversity Gain Hierarchy could be complied with, and that the biodiversity gain condition could be discharged. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies EN12 (Biodiversity and the Green Network), EN14 (Trees, Hedges and Woodland) and H11 (Development of Private Residential Gardens) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and paragraphs 136, 180 and 186 of the NPPF 2023.

7. The proposed vehicular parking layout due to excessive number of accesses and pavement crossovers would harmfully impact on pedestrian safety and the availability of on-street parking. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies TR3 and TR5 of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019.

8. In the absence of a completed legal agreement to secure an acceptable contribution towards the provision of Affordable Housing, the proposal fails to contribute adequately to the housing needs of Reading Borough and the need to provide sustainable mixed and balanced communities. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies H3 (Affordable Housing) and CC9 (Securing Infrastructure) of the Reading Borough Local Plan 2019 and the Council's Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2021 and paragraph 64 of the NPPF 2023.

Informatives

1. The application has been assessed based on the following submitted information:
 - P.M. 400 Rev D- Proposed Site Plan 15.5.24
 - P.M.500 Rev B – Proposed Ground Floor Plan 15.5.24
 - P.M.501 Rev C – Proposed First Floor Plan 15.5.24
 - P.M.502 Rev B -Proposed Second Floor Plan 15.5.24
 - P.M.503 Rev A- Proposed Floor Plans 15.5.24
 - P.M.600 Rev B – Proposed Elevations 15.5.24
 - P.M.601 Rev C- Proposed Rear and Side elevations 15.5.24
 - P.M.602 Rev B- Street Scenes 15.5.24
 - P.M.603 Rev A- Plot 1 Proposed Elevations 15.5.24

P.M.604 Rev A- Cycle Bin Store Floor Plans and Elevations 15.5.24
P.M.701 Rev A- & P.M.702 Rev A - Proposed 3d Views 15.5.24
Air Quality Assessment – July 2024
Environmental Noise Assessment – June 2024
Topographical Survey – July 2024 2.
Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan – July 2024
Root Protection Area Plan - July
Ecological Appraisal – 31/7/2024
Biodiversity Net Gain – Biological Impact Assessment
Received 20.08.24

2. The local planning authority has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive by advising of the concerns with proposal and providing for the opportunity for the application to be withdrawn. The applicant chose not to withdraw the application, hence the issuing this refusal notice within the statutory time period.

3. Without prejudice to any future application or appeal, the applicant is advised that reason for refusal 8 could be overcome with the completion of a satisfactory s106 legal agreement.

4. The applicant is advised that the refused scheme, had it been able to be approved, would have been a CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) liable development.